

### REMARKS

The present application was filed on July 20, 2000 with claims 1-20. Claim 8 was canceled in an Amendment filed December 4, 2003. Claims 1-7 and 9-20 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 13, 14 and 16-20 are the independent claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Claims 1, 13, 14 and 16-20 stand rejected under §112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner initially argues that the claims are somehow indefinite because they fail to state explicitly where certain web content or files are retrieved from, but instead simply state that such web content or files are retrieved in general. Applicants submit that it is entirely appropriate to use the more general limitation, and such usage does not render the claim indefinite within the meaning of §112, second paragraph. In fact, dependent claim 6 provides an illustration of where the web content may be retrieved from, that is, a separate server. It is also possible for such web content to be provided in other ways, and hence the use of the more general limitation in the corresponding independent claim 1.

The Examiner objects to the recitation “associated with at least one of the web content and the particular client type.” This is a straightforward recitation, of the form “at least one of A and B,” which simply means A alone, B alone, or both A and B. Accordingly, the recitation is readily understandable as referring to association with either the web content, the particular client type, or both the web content and the particular client type, and is not indefinite in any way. As to the phrase “associated with,” it is indeed broad, but it is not indefinite, nor is there any reasonable ground upon which it should be narrowly construed as “stored with.” Augmentation files could be associated with web content or client type using techniques other than common storage of such elements, as will be readily appreciated by those skilled in the art. For example, the augmentation files and web content could be stored remotely from one another, but with appropriate linkage via identifiers, tables, etc.

Finally, the Examiner objects to the term “virtual client device” in claims 13 and 14. However, the specification at, for example, page 13, lines 16-19, clearly indicates that the virtual client device is something other than a physical client device. Thus, a virtual client device is not “a

device that can perform many features that separate physical devices can perform,” as alleged by the Examiner. Instead, it is not an actual client device at all, but rather something that is simulated or artificially created, in accordance with the standard and well-understood meaning of the word “virtual.”

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 12-14 and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,626,958 (hereinafter “McCauley”). The remaining claims are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over McCauley in combination with U.S. Patent No. 6,421,733 (hereinafter “Tso”) or U.S. Patent No. 6,345,279 (hereinafter “Li”). Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(e) and §103(a) rejections, for substantially the same reasons set forth in their previous response filed October 6, 2004, said response being incorporated herein by reference in its entirety.

The Examiner in response to the arguments presented in the October 6, 2004 response argues that the term “pattern matching” may be construed as covering arrangements involving mere selection of page and pane renderers as described in McCauley. We continue to believe that this interpretation of the term in question is without merit, and accordingly traverse. Notwithstanding the traversal, independent claims 1 and 18-20 have been amended to specify that the recited pattern matching process comprises comparing a given one of the component structures of the retrieved web content to predetermined component structures represented by respective tokens in the one or more augmentation files. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification at, for example, page 7, line 10, to page 8, line 2. There is clearly no pattern matching process of this type disclosed or suggested in McCauley. However, in view of the foregoing traversal, it is respectfully submitted that the amendment is not made for purposes of patentability relative to McCauley, Tso, Li or other prior art, but is instead made solely in order to expedite prosecution of the application.


With regard to independent claims 13 and 14, the concept of a “virtual client device” was discussed above. The Examiner in formulating the rejection relies on actual client devices, but a virtual client device by its very name is something other than an actual client device. Accordingly, claims 13 and 14 are believed to be allowable over McCauley.

With regard to claims 16 and 17, there is no teaching or suggestion in McCauley regarding the claimed default augmentation files. Each of the page and pane renderers disclosed in McCauley and relied upon by the Examiner is apparently designed for association with particular types of

content. There does not seem to be any renderer or other file that is used as a default augmentation file in the manner set forth in these claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the §112, §102(e) and §103(a) rejections. The pending claims 1-7 and 9-20 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Joseph B. Ryan". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style with a large initial "J" and a prominent "R".

Date: June 27, 2005

Joseph B. Ryan  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 37,922  
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP  
90 Forest Avenue  
Locust Valley, NY 11560  
(516) 759-7517